
Minutes

Board of Natural Resources

August 19, 2004
Red Lion Inn, Port Angeles, Washington

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington, College of Forest Resources

R. James Cook, Interim Dean, Washington State University, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sutherland called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. on, August 19, 2004, in the Juan De Fuca Room at the Red Lion Inn, Port Angeles, Washington.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Jim Cook moved to approve the July 6, 2004, Board of Natural Resources Minutes.

SECOND: Glen Huntingford seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR AGENDA ACTION ITEMS

Pat Menge - North Kitsap Citizen

Ms. Menge referenced the Hansville Land sale and expressed her concern over the Tribe purchasing the parcel. She stated that the easement makes it inaccessible to the public.

Ron Charles - Chairman Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe

Mr. Charles said he has been interested in this property for a long time and that it abuts the south end of his reservation. He expressed his concern over who will acquire this property in the future because harvesting activity could impact water quality and shellfish harvesting. He stated that in his opinion S'Klallam Tribe would be a good steward of the property. He commented that there is a long-term lease on the road with the County and if the Tribe were to acquire the land they would have no intention of closing the road to anyone or breaking the lease currently in place. He stated that there is a closed landfill east of the reservation and its causing part of their land to be unusable; they see the DNR land as being possible mitigation for the fact that they may not be able to use some of their land for many years. He said they would have an active voice on whoever acquires the property.

Ms. Bergeson asked about the contamination from the landfill.

Mr. Charles responded that there is contamination leaking in a westerly direction and the water and berries cannot be consumed in that area.

Bill Parnall - North Kitsap

Mr. Parnall said that he lives on a road that is near the Hansville property. He stated that citizens are concerned about the sale because of environmental issues, the Growth Management Act, and accessibility, more than who actually owns the land. He commented that there should be an extension of 60-120 days for the auction.

LAND TRANSACTIONS

Hansville North Land Sale - #02-053669 (Handout 1)

Debi VanBuren began with background information on the Hansville properties.

Hansville Public Auctions

- Common School trust land
- Located in North Kitsap County
- Approximately 2 miles north of Kingston
- Entire section acquired at Statehood (1889)
- 391 acres remain in State ownership
- 1993 Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribe expressed interest in a future purchase of the 391 acres and prepaid initial administrative costs
- 2001 Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribe reconfirmed interest in purchase
- 2001 County/DNR co-hosted a public meeting
- 2001-2003 various public entities expressed interest in purchasing property:
 - o Kitsap County
 - o Port of Kingston
 - o North Kitsap School District
- December 2003 decision to offer parcel at Public Auction
- January 2004 public meeting
 - o Announced auction proposal
- August 2004 information meeting
 - o Announced parcel configuration for auction
- Several parcel configuration scenarios reviewed
- Conclusion: divide property into three parcels
- Zoned rural wooded: 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres
- Appraisals and appraisal review by 3rd party plus appraisal review by DNR appraiser

Description of Hansville North property: 101 acres (wetlands 0, streams 0); access: Hansville and Little Boston Roads; Land: \$500,000 (\$5,000 /acre); Timber: \$750,000; Total: \$1,250,000 (minimum bid)

Description of Hansville West property: 141 acres (wetlands 0, stream buffers 18 acres); Access: Little Boston Road; Land: \$640,000 (\$4,500/ac); Timber: \$200,000; Total: \$840,000 (minimum bid)

Description of Hansville South property: 149 acres (wetlands 13.5 acres, stream buffers 23 acres); Access: Hansville Rd and 288th Street; Land: \$709,000 (\$4,750/ac); Timber: \$981,000; Total: \$1,690,000 (minimum bid)

Mr. Huntingford asked if there could be a 90-day extension?

Chair Sutherland explained that upon receipt of the letter from citizens there had been discussions about the 60-day extension versus the 90-day, he didn't see a reason why it couldn't be moved to 90 days but it would put the deadline right at the statutory time limit from the time the Board makes a decision and the sale happens. He felt that pushing it out 90 days could pose risks just in case some fluke occurrence happened at that point but he did support an additional 30 days to the 60-day period.

Ms. Bergeson asked if in the event that an unforeseen event occurred would the worst-case scenario be starting the whole process over?

Chair Sutherland responded that it wouldn't be the entire process, mainly the cruise and the appraisal.

Ms. Bergeson asked if the Tribe purchased the land could there be language added to the sale guaranteeing access to the road in question?

Kathy Gerla, Assisant Attorney General, came forward. She explained that if in fact DNR had given an easement to the county in perpetuity for a road then whoever purchases the property would take the property with all encumbrances on the title including any existing easements, including the Tribe.

Dr. Cook asked for clarification on the location of the road.

Ms. VanBuren responded that there is a 30-foot easement on the property.

Ms. Bergeson said there should be an additional step built in to the sale guaranteeing access to this road.

Ron Charles came forward and assured the Board that there would be no reason to block access to the road in the future, if the Tribe acquired it.

MOTION: Jim Cook moved to approve Resolution #1131.

SECOND: Bob Nichols seconded.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Huntingford added that in the past there has been situations where citizens have wrestled with Growth Management Act issues among others only to have a Tribe come in and purchase land and then subdivide it into 2-acre parcels. He wanted to point out that it's not always a level playing field and that should be kept in mind as situations such as this arise. However he did add that he is in full support of the Tribes being able to take care of themselves and their respective communities.

Mr. Bare thought it would be helpful to understand the history of land use and density of development on existing tribal lands.

Ms. VanBuren did not have that specific information.

Mr. Cook said he feels confident that the issue of the road is small enough that he'd like to move forward with the Hansville sale.

Ms. Bergeson said again that she would like a stipulation built into the agreement stating that if the tribe were to acquire ownership, there would be a commitment by the tribe to continue that in perpetuity.

Chair Sutherland responded that he didn't think they could do that, but he would have Ms. VanBuren make sure that it was in perpetuity and that closure was not an option regardless of who purchases it.

Ms. VanBuren responded that the county has the right to use the road and she would look into the details of the situation.

Mr. Nichols asked if there were any land use issues on this parcel.

Ms. VanBuren said there had been one harvest on this parcel, which is outside the urban growth boundary.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Bruce Bare moved to approve Resolution #1132.

SECOND: Jim Cook seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Bruce Bare moved to approve Resolution #1133.

SECOND: Glen Huntingford seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR REPORTS

Chair Sutherland stated that Bruce Mackey, Land Steward for DNR, would be presenting the Sustainable Harvest Calculation.

Mr. Mackey stated that his goal for today's meeting would be to give the Board analysis and perspective on the policies the Board put forward and how they play out in the model for the 636 MMBF/year harvest in decade one versus 597 MMBF/year harvest in decade one -- versions of the preferred alternative. He said he would be presenting a proposed draft resolution for the 597 run. He referenced his PowerPoint presentation pointing out that the Board, by law, is required to calculate a sustainable decadal harvest volume that will continue without major prolonged curtailment or cessation. The applicable RCW requires the Board to determine a sustainable harvest level for one decade while also considering both economic and biological sustainability as well as intergenerational equity for future decades.

Mr. Mackey noted that the Board has been working since 2000 to fulfill its fiduciary responsibility by finding a balance for state trust lands that generates revenue for schools and other trusts while also creating healthy ecosystems; by meeting both of those goals it would clearly benefit all the people of Washington.

He talked about the process saying that several policy options were identified and six different stewardship strategies were developed and analyzed to achieve the economic and environmental consequences of the Board's proposed policies.

Slide 4: (Handout 2)

- First time Environmental Impact Statement used to analyze sustainability
- Dozens of public meetings and individual interest-group meetings
- Hundreds of comments received and addressed
- Independent Technical Advisory Committee used to oversee modeling and science

DEIS was published in November 2003

- No preferred alternative was selected in DEIS
- Six strategies as alternatives and their potential environmental impacts were analyzed (all met the legal requirements and contractual commitments of DNR)

Mr. Mackey said that the Board had relied upon multiple sources to formulate sustainable forestry policies and a preferred alternative was analyzed in the FEIS. Some of the major sources:

- DEIS scoping comments
- Feedback from multiple public meetings
- Extensive written comments
- Direct public comments at BNR meetings
- Direct public comments at special BNR sustainable forestry workshops
- Extensive outputs from the OPTIONS model
- Technical Advisory Committee
- Economic Resiliency Study

He said DNR's goal was to give the Board knowledge and information to carry out their trust duties, adopt sustainable forestry policies, and ultimately set a decadal sustainable harvest volume that would cover 2005-2014. He commented that through the entire process the Board has given the Department clear direction and he thanked them for that. He noted that the Board had given direction on items such as interdecadal variability (plus or minus 25%) and having frequent reports to the Board to monitor progress in implementing the sustainable harvest over time. Active management consistent with the fiduciary responsibilities and the HCP requirements and biodiversity pathways was shown on the first day of the tour and he felt that it demonstrated the policies that the Board put in place were consistent with what the Department is doing on the ground. He talked about how the tour was set up to look at four types of forest structures and it was an insightful way to look at practical applications of biodiversity thinning. He mentioned the attachment to resolution 1110, entitled, "Management Principles and Objectives" as proposed by Ms. Bergeson and adopted by the Board. He referenced Resolution 1134, which is a draft resolution for the Board's consideration. The pending resolution had three policies that direct the sustainable forestry management in the future and become part of the Forest Resource Plan; it also sets a decadal sustainable harvest, which DNR recommends at 5.97 billion board feet for the planning decade of 2005-2014. He wanted to convey to the Board that the recommendation of 597 MMBF/year harvest level allows DNR to meet the Board's policy intent. He wanted to show a comparison of the 636, which was the preferred alternative in the FEIS, and the 597 run which tried to meet the policy objectives and in fact modeled them closer than the 636 harvest level. He stated that both decadal numbers are very similar for the following reasons:

- Both reflect the policy intent
- Both have about the same NPV over the life of the HCP
- Both comply with the requirements of the HCP
- Both create about the same amount of older forests conditions over the life of the HCP
- Both have substantially more standing inventory at the end of the HCP

He stated that DNR recommend a harvest level of 597 MMBF/year in decade one for the following reasons:

- 597 smoothes out the income and the volume variation between decades for the individual trusts over the life of the HCP

- 597 is operationally obtainable in the first decade

Mr. Mackey said that both numbers produce about the same amount of volume but the 597 MMBF harvest level leads to the production more total volume in the first two decades. He noted that the Board was very clear on the point that they did not want income variation greater than 25% between decades for the county forest board transfer lands and other trusts. He said that when they are broken down into 17 counties that's a difficult goal to reach. He stated that with the 597 MMBF run, only four, not nine, forest board transfer counties have volume variation greater than 25% between decade one and decade two; the variability is less dramatic.

Chair Sutherland asked if the variability was based on current practices?

Mr. Mackey said no it's the variability between the average annual decadal amount.

Mr. Bare asked for a graph showing combined ownerships and wondered why they were only looking at the 17 counties?

Mr. Mackey responded that the 17 counties violated the Board's policies.

Mr. Bare asked if the other counties did not violate the policies.

Mr. Mackey said if you were to keep the counties lumped in the five federal, OESF, and Capital Forest groups they would not violate the policies.

Mr. Hulseby came forward and explained that there was about 130 million board feet of forest board land on the Westside of the State.

Ms. Bergeson asked if they were to choose the 636 MMBF harvest number and tried to make some variation in places that violated the policy, how complex would it be?

Ms. Bergeson wanted to know the impact of cut level on each county.

Mr. Brodie said 597 MMBF is the Department's best attempt at getting all the ownership groups within the 25% variability.

Ms. Bergeson asked for examples of landscape issues for different counties to better understand the impacts of the harvest level.

Mr. Huntingford asked if by going from a harvest level of 636 to 597 MMBF/year, the counties on the low end would not see an increase in harvest?

Mr. Brodie said it would be more of a timing issue, for example, if the inventory were there in a specific county would you take it in the first decade or spread it out over the first two decades to prevent a variability of starting at a high level and then not having an inventory for further harvest.

Mr. Cook said that the variation percentages are misleading and he'd like to see real numbers for each county and how significant they are to the total budget.

Mr. Huntingford said that for some counties one load of logs could mean a significant difference in their budget.

Mr. Mackey said in Clark county there is more than a 25% variation from decade one to two as their volume would go from 10 to 13 billion board feet; Mason county goes from 5 to 7 and that again is more than 25%; Thurston County receives more than 25%, as well as Wahkiakum County.

Mr. Bare suggested some word changes and he said he is bothered by the fact that the policy is changing. He felt that the policy should be set at 25% and then they should find a way to achieve that.

Mr. Mackey responded that if the Board wanted to meet that policy then it would decrease the overall decadal harvest for all the trusts.

Mr. Bare said that the resolution was written as a constraint but it should be written as a goal.

Mr. Mackey said given the Board's direction the drivers are the Board's policies. Instead of focusing just on a number the policies should be the main focus.

Mr. Mackey talked about wording in the resolution and said that they ran the model trying to meet the +/- 25%.

Mr. Bare asked what was changed between the two computer runs that produced 636 and the 597 MMBF/year in the modeling?

Mr. Brodie responded that the only thing that changed were the harvest targets.

Mr. Bare asked how that was done?

Mr. Brodie said they ran the model with the preferred alternative and got the output then ran the model again with the implementation run.

Mr. Bare still wanted to know what had changed?

Mr. Brodie said they changed the harvest targets for each ownership group.

Mr. Bare responded that he understood that the goal had been reduced.

Mr. Brodie said that was correct.

Mr. Bare stated that apparently, 636 MMBF/year could not be harvested in the first decade due to lack of staff and budget. He added that by reducing the harvest level to 597 MMBF it apparently addressed the temporal problems. He wondered if that was what drove the 597 result.

Mr. Mackey said that's exactly what drove the 597 and he said he could not make the commitment to reach 636 and continue that throughout the decade. If the Board directs DNR to reach that goal then they would do it.

Mr. Bare said the difference in harvest levels between the first decade (636 MMBF) to the second decade (514 MMBF) is within the 25% policy goal set by the Board.

Mr. Brodie pointed to the pivot table that he brought and explained that the numbers from a modeling perspective were the drops.

Mr. Cook said that under the 636 MMBF harvest level, Skagit County goes from 49 to 18 MMBF and then stabilizes; under the 597 MMBF harvest level you take a dip by reducing it to 38 MMBF then it goes up to 33 and is fairly stable after that.

Mr. Mackey said that some counties go up 63% but Skagit County goes down 63% under those circumstances.

Mr. Bare commented that he felt that at the end of the 10th year, we would not actually see the harvest level decrease to the predicted level of 514 MMBF/year due to replanning. That is, in ten years a new sustainable harvest level would be calculated and the assumption and the timber inventory would be so different from what we thought would occur, the next decade's harvest would be significantly different from 514 MMBF/year.

Mr. Bare wanted to be shown the annual harvests in the first decade that led to the average decadal harvest level of 636 MMBF/year.

Ms. Bergeson said the last time they talked about 636 there was nothing in the runs that would lead you to think there was an average of 636.

Ms. Bergeson asked if the Department could reach the 636 without going above the 25% management fee?

Mr. Mackey said no, it could only be achieved with more money being retained by the Department.

Mr. Mackey said that once the Board makes a policy decision they would be in a much better position to go to the legislature and ask for more funding.

Ms. Bergeson said there needs to be a return to the common school trust that people feel comfortable with and silviculture techniques should be applied to build habitat while they implement the fiduciary responsibilities of the trusts.

Mr. Mackey said that was a good point. He asked what the right decision was in regards to the beneficiaries? With Board direction the Department would do an economic analysis with the Board including outside input from constituents and the beneficiaries and then take it to the legislature.

Mr. Bare pointed out that objective five in the Management Principles that the Board agreed upon talks about the limit of a 25% management fee as an objective not a constraint.

Mr. Cook stated that the Board would be negligent if they were to allow current practices to continue; by moving toward the 597 or the 636 MMBF/year harvest levels there is still net gain to the trust. He expressed his desire to move forward with this decision.

Chair Sutherland said that he would have staff brief the Board members with any additional information they felt they needed before the September 7th BNR meeting.

Ms. Bergeson asked for a cost benefit ratio with these numbers.

Mr. Huntingford suggested the Board move ahead on this decision and have a draft resolution at the September 7th BNR meeting. He felt that instead of focusing too much attention on the details it would be more effective to make the policy decisions and then let staff work on the details with the Board's support.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR GENERAL ITEMS OF INTEREST

Norm Schaaf - Board of Directors Olympic Logging Conference (Handout 3)

Mr. Schaaf said that at their April 2004 meeting his Board passed two resolutions that are of interest to DNR and the Board of Natural Resources. The first resolution gave the support of the Olympic Logging Conference for the harvest level of 636 for Westside State lands; the second resolution was the Olympic Logging Conference opposing the certification of State lands. The Olympic Logging Conference has been around for sixty years and represents mills, landowners, loggers, accounting firms, suppliers, and banks.

Rob Capelle - Public Citizen

Mr. Capelle explained that he and his wife own the Hoh River Resort. He expressed his concern over the Western River Conservancy group and explained that timber harvest is still a big portion of the West end. He felt that taking land off base does not make sense and that this group is trying to acquire more land along the river and he is wondering what the Board's stance is on this issue.

John Richmond - Resident of Hoh River Valley (Handout 4)

Mr. Richmond gave the Board a petition that was signed by Hoh River residents. The following is a statement by the residents: "This petition is addressed to all Federal, State, and County agencies involved in land acquisition using federal funds. The Hoh River is also known as the Hoh River Corridor and is located on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula in Jefferson County in the State of Washington. We, the undersigned, are community residents or property owners of the Hoh River Valley and we wish to let you know that there is no community support for the use of federal funds by conservation groups to buy land in this valley. We do not want federal monies from the Endangered Species Conservation Fund or any other federal fund used by any conservation group such as Western Rivers Conservancy, Hoh River Trust, Wild Salmon Center, or Ecotrust to buy lands on the Hoh River."

Rod Fleck

Mr. Fleck requested that the public be given a revised table of chapter 4 before the September 7th meeting, that way they can analyze and compare apples to apples. He expressed concern over the July discussion regarding arrearage and how it would be metered out throughout the decade. He questioned intergenerational equity saying that it can also work backwards and in the case of arrearage would they be benefiting the future generations at the cost of the present generation?

Phil Kitchel - Olympic Resource Council

Mr. Kitchel wanted to know what assumptions went into the modeling of 597 & 636 specifically regarding how off base acres were designated. He wanted to know what the Old Growth volumes were; he said the older stands would generate more money.

Earl Kerr - Public Citizen

Mr. Kerr stated that he is a small landowner and would be severely impacted by the proposed rules on riparian areas. He referred to the Forest Practices Act and talked about the easement program and suggested using some proceeds from timber harvest to pump up the easement program.

Chair Sutherland pointed out that the riparian easement program is funded out of the general fund authorized by the legislature; the funds that are generated by the management of the trust lands go

strictly to the trusts and it is not in his power and against the law to use funds in any way other than how the structure is legally mandated.

Carol Johnson - North Olympic Timber Action Committee

Ms. Johnson said the SHC process has been ongoing for three years and there would always be questions that can't be answered. In regards to the three circles the environmental issues are regulated, the market drives the economic, and the social aspect may never be satisfied by everyone but it's time to make a decision one way or the other. She then quoted a song with the following lyrics: "The more you study the more you know, the more you know the more you forget, the more you forget the less you know, so why study? The less you study the less you know, the less you know the less you forget the less you forget the more you know, so why study?" She compared this process to that lesson.

Becky Kelley - Washington Environmental Council

Ms. Kelley stated that she hoped the Board did not set 636 as the harvest level because she doesn't feel that DNR can meet it. She referenced the Federal agreements that are currently being negotiated and pointed out that under the preferred alternative there is more harvesting in the riparian areas. Although she does not support the 636 or the 597 if the Board were to choose the 597 she encouraged the Board to truly believe that legally and operationally DNR could meet that goal. She pointed out that under the preferred alternative 80% of the harvest would be type B, mostly clear-cutting. She said that it had been requested to do a model run on biodiversity pathways across the landscape but that it was never done, she was disappointed in that fact and felt that it was a lost opportunity. She stated that the Department did show the Board what poor health the forests are in which had not been done in previous years and that it would be the context of their decision. She finished by remarking that through a public disclosure request she obtained numbers from DNR related to the SHC and suggested that the Board review those same documents.

Eric Harlow - Washington Forest Law Center

Mr. Harlow remarked on the discussions regarding meeting the 25% variation by county. In his opinion it was not a constraint used in the model because the model does not meet the 25%. He questioned whether or not the target level was chosen and modeled to justify the number or if the policies were set and then modeled to see what would be possible in a target level. He wanted to know more about the modeling by county and how that interplayed with the policies and other model constraints? He expressed concern that some numbers were not included in the FEIS; he said the pivot tables make it difficult for the Board and the public to assess what's going on decade by decade. He felt that there were variations by county in the harvest levels and that concerns him. He discussed arrearage and said that arrearage is being rolled into the process and it shouldn't be.

Jim Haguewood - Clallam County Economic Development Council

Mr. Haguewood and the council extended their compliments to the Board and Commissioner Sutherland for work on this extensive process. He talked about the Clallam Networks Industry Cluster Strategy; in 2002 they began an active process to shift a billion dollar economy. He stated that there has been a 30-year decline in average wage in Clallam County and a significant shift away from manufacturing jobs, which has resulted in declining K-12 enrollment. Due to the lack of high paying jobs Clallam County has some of the highest public sector health care reimbursement percentages in the State of Washington. He extended his thanks to Charlie Cortelyou for his participation in the Forest Resources Cluster Team chaired by Mike Hannan and Bill Hermann. He discussed some of the activities that take place such as "the black box project" regarding timber resource assessment and identifying emerging markets. He pointed out the Alder market and value-added resources. He stated that they continue to support alternative 5 or an aspect of it that can be incorporated into the OESF through the preferred alternative.

Mike Doherty - Clallam County Commissioner

Mr. Doherty thanked Charlie Cortelyou, Al Vaughan, and DNR staff for their efforts and work on the SHC process. He said that the Association of Counties including Tom Robinson has a great working partnership and he also thanked Judy Wilson for her assistance with the communities. He talked about the Olympic Discovery trail and the concern over some possible lease rate on DNR land. He stated that Clallam County has an excellent natural resource program at their skill center where the workforce needed for this transition could be educated.

Ms. Bergeson said she would like to continue discussions about the skill center because it's an exciting prospect.

Marilyn Lewis - Hoh River Resident

Ms. Lewis said she owns 164 acres on the Hoh River. She is concerned about the Western River Conservancy group and how the area could be impacted if they were to acquire lands on the Hoh River. She stated that if they were to buy lands they might restrict public access. She said she has been a good neighbor to DNR and would be disappointed if the Department were to support these groups in their mission to acquire land on the Hoh River.

Kellie Daniels - Premier Forest Products

Ms. Daniels explained that she would be speaking today on behalf of the Lake Quinalt School District and the Superintendent. She read some of his comments to the Board stating that he supports the efforts of DNR to increase harvest on State lands and specifically the 370,000 acres in Olympic Region and 240,000 in the OESF. He urged the Board to actively manage those lands for financial benefit of the trusts. She pointed out that the difference between alternative 5 and the preferred alternative is around 69 million board feet, which is significant, and he wonders why they did not choose alternative 5. He finds the reduced level of harvest in Jefferson County troublesome because it is close to his school district and a large percentage of the trust lands within the OESF are Common School and UW Trust lands. He urged the Board to actively manage Old Growth as part of the on base lands. She spoke on her behalf and asked how adopting Resolution 1134 and the attachment would impact the Forest Resource Plan policies on older mature timber stands and how would it be altered to exclude those stands.

Bruce Mackey came forward to say that the reality is that the EIS is one piece of information not a compilation of everything that has been done on the process. He stated that there have been numerous models requested by the Board and they have all been made public, there are no hidden numbers or data.

Glen Huntingford stated that DNR is doing a lot of good work and thanked the foresters for their work.

Chair Sutherland asked if there was anyone else present wishing to make comment before the Board? Seeing none, hearing none.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:36

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2004

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington

R. James Cook, Dean, Washington State University (Interim)

Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County

Attest:

Sasha Lange, Board Coordinator